

**REMARKS**

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments which have greatly  
5 assisted Applicant in responding.

**35 U.S.C. §112**

2. 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner has rejected Claim 16 under 35  
10 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because such Claim recites "said merchant website" for  
which there is no antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended Claims 16 and 48 accordingly. Applicant changed the word,  
merchant , to destination. Support can be found in the Summary of the Specification.

15

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35  
U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

**Corrections**

20

3. Corrections. Applicant has amended the following claims to correct inadvertent  
typos: 23, 28, and 60.

**35 U.S.C. §102**

25

4. 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 1-3, 9-10, 12-14, 21-23, 25-27, 29-30, 33-35, 41-42,  
44-46, 53-55, 57-59, and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being  
anticipated by Kanevsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,947). Applicant respectfully disagrees.  
Applicant respectfully submits that Kanevsky fails to teach the present invention as claimed.

30

Claims 1, 2, 33, and 34

Claim 1 appears as follows:

35

1. (original) A method for changing user interaction with a website comprising the  
steps of:

parsing a website;  
noting elements on said website; and  
viewing said website through an overlay, said overlay containing overlay  
elements capable of interacting with said website elements and said overlay  
capable of adding and removing the appearance of website elements.

The Examiner stated that Kanevsky teaches "viewing said website through an overlay, said overlay containing overlay elements capable of interacting with said website elements and said overlay capable of adding and removing the appearance of website elements".  
Applicant respectfully disagrees as follows.

Kanevsky teaches a web site design incorporates features that permit automatic display of the content of home pages in a friendly manner for a user viewing this content from a screen or window of a certain size. For example, if a size of a display screen or window allows, links are displayed with some text or pictures to which they are linked. Conversely, if a size of a screen or window does not allow display of all textual and icon information on a whole screen or window, the home page is mapped into hierarchically linked new smaller pages that fully fit the current display or window. The unique display strategy of the invention is provided by a web page adaptation scheme that is implemented on a web site server or is incorporated in a web browser, e.g. as a java applet, or both. (See Abstract.)

Kanevsky fails to teach "viewing said website through an overlay, said overlay containing overlay elements capable of interacting with said website elements and said overlay capable of adding and removing the appearance of website elements", as claimed in Claims 1, 2, 33, and 34. At most, Kanevsky teaches adapting the same website viewable information in relation to display screen-related attributes of the user's device (See Kanevsky's as a whole and Kanevsky's Claim 1). No where does Kanevsky teach an overlay, and said overlay containing overlay elements capable of interacting with website elements.

Therefore, Kanevsky does not teach or disclose the invention as claimed. Thus, Applicant is of the opinion that Claims 1, 2, 33, and 34 are in allowable condition. Accordingly, Claims 3, 9-10, 12-14, 21-23, 25-27, 29-30, 35, 41-42, 44-46, 53-55, 57-59, and 61-62 dependent directly or indirectly from Claims 1 and 33, respectively, and hence are deemed in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

**35 U.S.C. §103**

5. 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 4, 15-20, 31-32, 36, 47-52 and 63-64 are rejected  
5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Armes (Pub.  
No. US2001/0024720).

The rejection of Claims 4, 15-20, 31-32, 36, 47-52 and 63-64 is deemed moot in view of  
Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 1, 2, 33, and 34 hereinabove. Therefore, Applicant  
10 respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

6. 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 5-8, 11, 37-40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.  
§103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Katinsky (U.S. Pat. No.  
6,452,609).

15 The rejection of Claims 5-8, 11, 37-40 and 43 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's  
remarks regarding Claims 1, 2, 33, and 34 hereinabove. Therefore, Applicant respectfully  
requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

- 20 7. 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 24 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as  
being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Kanojia (U.S. Pat. No. 6,714,992).

The rejection of Claims 24 and 56 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding  
Claims 1, 2, 33, and 34 hereinabove. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the  
25 Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

8. 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 28 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as  
being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Strahorn (U.S. Pat. No. 5,933,140).

30 The rejection of Claims 28 and 60 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding  
Claims 1, 2, 33, and 34 hereinabove. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the  
Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

9. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claims solely for the  
35 purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's  
Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such amendment,


Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which Applicant considers the invention herein to be entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

5

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent. The Examiner is invited to call to discuss the response. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-1445.

Respectfully Submitted,



Julia A. Thomas,  
Reg. No. 52,283

Customer No. 22862